

REMARKS

With the entry of the present Amendment, claims 37, 39-49 and 51-59 are in this application. Claims 37-43 and 59-60 have been examined; claims 44-58 have been withdrawn. Claims 39, 50 and 60 are canceled without prejudice in the present Amendment. Claims 37, 40, 42-45, 47, 49, 51, 53 and 59 have been amended to better claim the invention; these amendments are believed to place this application in condition for allowance. None of the amendments made herein constitutes the addition of new matter.

Claim 59 is drawn to tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins having specified sequences. This is supported by Figures 5E and 5G and their descriptions at page 9, line 25 - page 10, line 2, page 19, lines 1-2, Tables 8, 10 and 18, and the corresponding sequences in the Sequence Listing, as well as at page 20 and at page 26. The specifically exemplified tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins are essentially tandem repeats of the MSP1 sequence with an intervening punctuation sequence. Claim 59 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 60, which is now canceled. Applicants respectfully note that claim 60, which depended from claim 59, was noted to contain allowable subject matter; the present amendment has the same effect as amending claim 60 to make it independent because the limitations of both claims 59 and 60 are incorporated into claim 59 as amended. Allowance of this claim is requested.

The MSP2 protein (SEQ ID NO:17) was previously found allowable. The Patent Office had suggested presenting a claim to a genus of membrane scaffold proteins that could be found allowable. Claim 59, drawn to a tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein, has been amended to incorporate (from claim 60, which depended from claim 59) the particular examples of tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins from the application (SEQ ID NOs:17, 19 and 45 and the portions of same lacking the N-terminal 12 amino acid histidine tags). In accordance with the discussion with the Patent Office,

claims to nanoscale particles comprising a tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein and a **tethered** membrane protein have been presented, as well as claims to a method of making such a nanoscale particle. Claim 37 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of a seven transmembrane segment integral membrane protein, in accordance with advice from the Examiner. Favorable consideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 59-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Patent Office has alleged that the Specification has not defined the term "tandem repeat membrane protein" unambiguously and that it is unclear whether the term refers to repeat of an amino acid sequence, a specific structure (such as a helix) or both.

Applicants respectfully point to the as-filed Specification at page 9, line 25 through page 10, line 2. Figs. 5E and 5G illustrate tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variants. See also page 19, lines 1-10, for a discussion of MSP, a tandem repeat of MSP1, in which the MSP1 (protein) sequences are separated by a short (4 amino acid) linker sequence. See also Tables 8, 10 and 18. The context is clear -- a tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variant is one in which a large (protein) sequence is repeated, with the protein sequences being separated by an intervening linker (or punctuation) sequence. It is clearly not a repeat of only a single helical structure or relatively short amino acid sequence.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the context of the application makes the claimed term abundantly clear to one of ordinary skill in the art. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, claim 59 has been amended to incorporate the sequence limitations of claim 60, and claim 60 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 60

depended from claim 59. The amendment of claim 59 is believed to render this claim allowable. The withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 37 and 59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Bayburt et al. (1998). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully note that the Bayburt paper describes particles prepared using cytochrome reductase and **naturally occurring** human apolipoprotein A1; see also Jonas et al. (1989) J. Biol. Chem. 264:4818-4824, already of record, where it is made clear that the Bayburt paper relates to apolipoprotein prepared from human plasma. By contrast, the present application relates to **artificial** membrane scaffold proteins, as described at pages 20 and 26. The artificial membrane scaffold proteins of the present invention are clearly distinguished from the naturally occurring human protein (isolated from plasma). Applicants refer the Examiner to the dictionary definition of "artificial": humanly contrived (see attached Exhibit A). However, it is clear from the context of the specification as filed, that the word "artificial" means, inter alia, that the membrane scaffold protein variants of the present invention have amino acid sequences that are different from the naturally occurring amino acid sequences. "Artificial" is not intended to be, in effect, a process limitation. That is, it is not intended to refer to how the protein is made, i.e., by recombinant technology, but rather a distinction that the (artificial) membrane scaffold protein is not the same in structure as any natural protein. Applicants' use of "artificial" in the context of the Specification is consistent with the dictionary definition of "humanly contrived". The Specification gives numerous non-limiting examples of the kinds of differences in structure between natural apoA1 and the artificial membrane scaffold protein variants of the present invention. For example, the Specification describes (artificial) membrane scaffold protein sequences in which certain helices of native apoA1 are repeated, deleted or replaced with other helices, or have truncations, or have altered hinge regions. See also pages 14, 19 and 28-29 of the as-filed specification. Because Bayburt et al. does not teach such modifications of apo A1,

it cannot properly be found to anticipate claims 37 and 59, and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn. It is not Applicants' intent to read on the use of naturally occurring human apolipoprotein A1 or a recombinant protein identical in amino acid sequence to human apolipoprotein as it occurs in nature, in conjunction with a tethered membrane protein, according to the definition of tethered membrane protein as given in the present Specification.

In addition, Applicants have now incorporated limitations of claim 38 into claim 37. This amendment was made in the interest of advancing prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection. The Examiner has indicated the allowability of claims where the nanoscale particle included a seven transmembrane segment protein. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration because both the protein incorporated and the membrane scaffold protein in the particles described by Bayburt *et al.* differ from those presently claimed..

However, in the interest of advancing prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, new claims 37, 39 and 40-46 are drawn to nanoscale particles comprising an artificial membrane scaffold protein and at least one integral membrane of seven transmembrane segments. Applicants respectfully urge that the claims should not be limited to receptor proteins with seven transmembrane segments. The Specification provides support for receptors proteins in general. At page 18, lines 5-17, it is stated that the integral membrane proteins "are exemplified by the 7-helix transmembrane proteins, including but not limited to bacteriorhodopsin from *Halobium halobacterium*, the 5-hydroxy tryptamine 1A G protein coupled receptor from *Homo sapiens* and other G protein coupled receptors..... cell surface receptors, and especially G protein coupled receptors, can be incorporated ...". Page 20, lines 18-20, states that "receptors incorporated into MSP disks are useful in structural, biochemical and pharmaceutical research."

The Bayburt reference relates to cytochrome P450 reductase, a tethered membrane protein, as defined in the present Specification. Those claims (47-48) drawn to nanoscale particles (and methods) comprising a tethered membrane protein are limited to the use of the membrane scaffold protein (MSP2) as set forth in SEQ ID NO:17, which was said to be allowable, as well as other tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins. The cited Bayburt reference relates to an apolipoprotein AI protein which is not a tandem repeat membrane protein. Compare, e.g., Tables 2 and 8 of the as-filed application. As discussed in the personal interview, there was no teaching or suggestion in the cited Bayburt reference that an embedded or integral membrane protein could be incorporated into a nanoscale particle, where the protein is maintained in an active conformation, like that of the native protein in a natural membrane environment.

With respect to the allegation that incorporation of an integral protein was taught by the cited Bayburt reference, Applicants respectfully refer to the definitions of types of membrane proteins in the present application, in the paragraph bridging pages 14 and 15:

Tethered membrane proteins are composed mostly of a relatively soluble globular domain external to the bilayer and relatively simple (e.g., a single pass helix) which anchors this domain to the membrane bilayer. The globular domain, in nature, can be extracellular or cytoplasmic in orientation. Embedded membrane proteins, as defined herein, are those which include a membrane anchoring segment of the polypeptide, but which also have groupings of hydrophobic amino acids on the surface of the protein, which hydrophobic domains are embedded within the membrane bilayer. Integral membrane proteins are predominantly located within the membrane bilayer; relatively small portions of the protein are exposed to an aqueous environment within the cell or to the extracellular aqueous environment.

As supported by the as-filed application, the particles claimed are distinct from those described in the cited Bayburt et al. reference. With respect to the statement of the Patent Office that Applicants cannot distinguish over the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have, in fact, distinguished in two ways -- the

recitation of an **artificial** membrane scaffold protein and in the recitation of integral membrane protein receptors.

Accordingly, it is maintained that the present invention as claimed is not anticipated by the cited prior art. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 42 and 60 were objected to because they recite nonelected subject matter, i.e., the amino acid sequences set forth in SEQ ID NOS: 6, 9, 19, 23, 29 and 43-45.

With respect to claims related to nanoscale particles and methods related to tethered membrane proteins, claims limited to the use of a tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variant having the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:17 were identified as allowable. In anticipation of allowability of claims to tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins and their uses in methods and particles, these claims recite tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variants of SEQ ID NO:17, amino acids 13 to amino acids 13 to 414 of SEQ ID NO:17, SEQ ID NO:19, amino acids 13 to 422 of SEQ ID NO:19, SEQ ID NO:45 and amino acids 13 to 392 of SEQ ID NO:45. Applicants respectfully request that examination be extended to additional exemplary artificial tandem repeat variant sequences. Applicants note that the Examiner, in a telephone interview on September 9, 2004, agreed to examine the sequences in claim 60.

Claims 38-43 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Claim 37 is drawn to a nanoscale particle comprising a membrane scaffold protein variant and an integral membrane protein. Dependent claims 38-43 are drawn to particular types and examples of integral membrane proteins and with respect to the membrane scaffold protein, various engineered membrane scaffold variants. Applicants have also provided a set of method claims identical in scope to those in the

claims to particles comprising a membrane scaffold protein variant and an integral membrane protein. Similarly, in accordance with the discussion with the Examiner in the personal interview, Applicants have presented claims drawn to nanoscale particles and methods of incorporating an embedded membrane protein in a nanoscale particle.

Claims 47-48 and 56-58 are drawn to a nanoscale particle comprising a tethered membrane protein and a tandem repeat membrane scaffold variant having the amino acid sequences set forth in SEQ ID NO:17 (MSP2), amino acids 13 to 414 of SEQ ID NO:17, SEQ ID NO:19, amino acids 13 to 422 of SEQ ID NO:19, SEQ ID NO:45 or amino acids 13 to 392 of SEQ ID NO:45, and methods with the same scope of membrane scaffold protein variant. The sequences of other specifically exemplified tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins are also recited in claim 60; claim 59 recites the use of a tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variant. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants recognize that there has been a restriction requirement with respect to membrane scaffold proteins and particles; however, rejoinder of method claims with allowable composition claims of the same scope is respectfully requested.

Claim 60 is drawn to a membrane scaffold protein having the amino acid set forth in SEQ ID NO:17, which has been deemed allowable, as well as other exemplary tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variants with or without a His tag at the N-terminus. The Examiner has indicated his willingness to consider claim 60 as written. Claim 59 is drawn to the genus of tandem repeat membrane scaffold protein variants. Support is found in Tables 8, 10 and 18 as well as at Figures 5E and 5G and descriptions thereof.

Request to Rejoin Nonelected Species

In the Restriction Requirement mailed on March 24, 2003, Applicants were required to elect a species for prosecution in connection with claims 11-13 because the claims are allegedly directed to three species of membrane protein: a tethered

membrane protein, an embedded membrane protein, and an integral membrane protein (all in association with a membrane scaffold protein in a nanoscale particle), which were deemed by the Examiner to be patentably distinct. Restriction to a single species was required for further prosecution if no generic claim was held to be allowable. In response, Applicants elected "integral membrane proteins."

As discussed above, Applicants have presented claims 37-43, which are drawn to nanoscale particles comprising integral membrane proteins in conjunction with membrane scaffold protein variants. Claims 44-46 are drawn to nanoscale particles comprising embedded membrane proteins in conjunction with membrane scaffold proteins variants, and claims 47-48 are drawn to nanoscale particles comprising tethered membrane proteins in conjunction with membrane scaffold protein variants. Applicants submit that in view of the amendments to the claims and for the reasons discussed above, taking the advice of the Examiner and his supervisor into account, the claims now presented are believed allowable. Applicants request withdrawal of the requirement for election of a single species of membrane protein and request rejoinder and reconsideration of claims directed to embedded membrane proteins, as well as tethered membrane proteins in conjunction with tandem repeat membrane scaffold proteins. Applicants have several embodiments of various membrane proteins incorporated into nanoscale particles, and they are entitled to claims of breadth commensurate with their contribution to the art.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and early notification thereof is requested.

If, in the interest of expediting prosecution, the Examiner has questions or comments, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the indicated telephone number.

Application No. 09/990,087
Amendment dated October 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2004

This Supplemental Amendment is accompanied by a Petition of Extension of Time and a check in the amount of \$215.00. It is believed that the present Amendment does not necessitate the payment of any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16-1.17. If this is incorrect, however, please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment pursuant to the foregoing Rules to Deposit Account No. 07-1969.

Respectfully submitted,



Donna M. Ferber
Registration No. 33,878
Customer No. 23713

GREENLEE, WINNER AND SULLIVAN, P.C.
5370 Manhattan Circle, Suite 201
Boulder, CO 80303
Telephone (303) 499-8080
Facsimile: (303) 499-8089
Email: winner@greenwin.com
Attorney Docket No.: 87-00
October 12, 2004